

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 27, 2006. Claims 43 to 60 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 to 42 having been cancelled, and Claims 43 to 60 substituted therefor. Claims 43, 48, 49, 54, 55 and 60 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 4, 12, 22, 30 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. Claims 4, 12, 22, 30 and 41 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of this rejection. The cancellation of these claims is seen to obviate this rejection.

Turning to the art-based rejections, Claims 1 to 5, 19 to 23, 35, 37 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,050 (Li); and Claims 9 to 13, 17, 27 to 31 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Li in view of a Siemens R&I article entitled "The Car That Called For Help", January 2000 (Siemens). Claims 1 to 5, 9 to 13, 17, 19 to 23, 27 to 31, 35, 37, 39 and 41 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter and without conceding the correctness of their rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Claims 43, 49 and 55

Newly-added independent Claim 43 is directed to an information processing apparatus. The apparatus includes a check unit adapted to check whether or not a product is under warranty, and a determination unit adapted to determine whether or not a repair fee estimate of the product is higher than a predetermined fee when, according to the check

unit, the product is not under warranty. The apparatus also includes a first presentation unit adapted to present a repair fee estimate of the product when it is determined by said determination unit that the repair fee estimate is not higher than the predetermined fee, and to present a repair fee estimate including information about new products when it is determined by said determination unit that the repair fee estimate is higher than the predetermined fee.

Newly-added independent Claims 49 and 55 are respectively directed to a method and a program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 43.

Thus, among its many features, the invention of Claims 43, 49 and 55 provides for (i) determining whether or not a repair fee estimate of a product is higher than a predetermined fee when the product is not under warranty, (ii) presenting a repair fee estimate of the product when the repair fee estimate is not higher than the predetermined fee, and (iii) presenting a repair fee estimate including information about new products when the repair fee estimate is higher than the predetermined fee.

By virtue of the foregoing, equipment repair requests and requests to purchase equipment can be more efficiently generated. The art applied against the cancelled claims is not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

In particular, although the Abstract of Li may be seen to disclose a system for administering warranty-specific service based on service information and a diagnosis of a vehicle, nothing in Li is seen to disclose or suggest determining whether or not a repair fee estimate of a product is higher than a predetermined fee when the product is not under warranty. Moreover, Li is not seen to disclose or suggest presenting a repair fee estimate of the product when the repair fee estimate is not higher than the predetermined fee, and

presenting a repair fee estimate including information about new products when the repair fee estimate is higher than the predetermined fee. Li is also not seen to disclose or suggest the attendant benefits provided by such determining and presenting of repair fee estimates.

In addition, Siemens has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Li.

Allowance of Claims 43, 49 and 55 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 48, 54 and 60

Newly-added independent Claim 48 as amended is directed to an information processing apparatus. The apparatus includes a check unit adapted to check whether or not a product is under warranty, and a calculation unit adapted to calculate a repair fee estimate of the product when, according to the check unit, the product is not under warranty. The apparatus also includes a presentation unit adapted to present a method of recovering the product when, according to the check unit, the product is under warranty.

Newly-added independent Claims 54 and 60 are respectively directed to a method and a program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 48.

Thus, among its many features, the invention of Claims 48, 54 and 60 provides for (i) checking whether or not a product is under warranty, (ii) calculating a repair fee estimate of the product when the product is not under warranty, and (iii) presenting a method of recovering the product when the product is under warranty.

By virtue of the foregoing, equipment repair requests and requests to purchase equipment can be more efficiently generated. The art applied against the cancelled claims is not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

As noted above, Li is seen to disclose a system for administering warranty-specific service based on service information and a diagnosis of a vehicle. However, nothing in Li is seen to disclose or suggest (i) checking whether or not a product is under warranty, (ii) calculating a repair fee estimate of the product when the product is not under warranty, and (iii) presenting a method of recovering the product when the product is under warranty. Li is also not seen to disclose or suggest the attendant benefits provided by such checking, calculating and presenting.

In addition, Siemens has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Li.

Allowance of Claims 48, 54 and 60 is therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, newly-added independent Claims 43, 48, 49, 54, 55 and 60 are believed to be allowable over the art applied against the cancelled claims.


The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the art applied against the cancelled claims for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Regarding a formal matter, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to acknowledge receipt of the Japanese priority application filed in this case on October 31, 2001.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 112907v1